DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 080 106 JC 730 181

TITLE	Texas Community Junior College Research 1972-1973. Second Annual Report.
INSTITUTION	Texas Association of Junior Coll. Instructional Administrators.
REPORT NO	AR-2
PUB DATE	10 Jun 73
NOTE	36p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Annual Reports; *Case Studies; Community Colleges; *Decision Making; *Enrollment Influences; Junior Colleges; *Management Systems; Minority Groups; Perception; Persistence; Post Secondary Education; *Surveys; Technical Reports

ABSTRACT

Three research projects supervised by the Research Committee of the Texas Association of Junior College Instructional Administrators are reported. The first, "Selected Aspects of Internal Decision-Making in Public -Supported Community Colleges in Texas as Perceived by Administrators. Faculty Members, and Student Leaders, involved the use of questionnaires in determining differences between the perceptions of the three groups. The second, "A Study of the Management Systems of the Junior Colleges in the State of Texas," was for the purpose of ascertaining the relationship of perception between members of the administrative group and the faculty group in response to the Likert management systems (exploitive authoritative, benevolent authoritative, consultative, and participative) and to determine the statistical relationship of these perceptions to certain institutional variables. The third, "A Study of Factors Which Influence Minority and Non-Minority Student Enrollment and Persistence in a Community College," also studied characteristics of non-attenders, non-persisters, and graduates, using case studies and questionnaires. Three additional research projects completed or in progress are listed. A feedback form for comments and suggestions to the Research Committee is provided. (KM)

ED 080106

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TEXAS COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE RESEARCH
1972-1973

SECOND ANNUAL REPORT

TO

THE TEXAS ASSOCIATION
OF
JUNIOR COLLEGE INSTRUCTIONAL ADMINISTRATORS

BY

THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

JUNE 10, 1973

JC 730 181

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

October 31, 1972

Chief Instructional Officers
Texas Community Junior Colleges

The Research Committee of the Texas Association of Junior College Instructional Administrators has been working with several of our university colleagues over the past two years. Our efforts have been directed toward developing a program of research which will provide each of us with information we need and will, at the same time, reduce the demands on each of us for time spent in completing questionnaires and answering inquiries.

You will be receiving, in the very near future, requests for assistance from Dr. Jim Tunnell, East Texas State University, and Dr. Ken Freeman, Texas Tech University.

Dr. Tunnell's project will be a status study of our collective faculties and will seek information on salaries, fringe benefits, faculty loads, etc. We hope that each junior college chief instructional officer will provide the data requested. Dr. Tunnell will then provide each of us with the results of his study. In this way we can reduce the time you spend on studies of this type.

Dr. Freeman's study will deal with our decision-making processes and the actual request for information will probably be made by doctoral student Raymond Yell.

At a later date, Dr. James Reynolds, University of Texas at Austin; Dr. Richard Strahan, University of Houston; and Dr. John Grable, Sam Houston State University, will be conducting studies at the request of the committee. Copies of this research will be mailed to you next summer.

Your Research Committee feels that each study merits your support and participation.

Sincerely,

George E. Thomas

George E. Thomas, Chairman
Research Committee
Texas Association of Junior College Instructional Administrators

cj

PREFACE

The Texas Association of Junior College Instructional Administrators was formed at the annual junior college convention in February 1969 and has been an active organization since that time. The membership of the organization is composed of the instructional administrators of the junior colleges of the state.

At the October 1970 meeting of T.A.J.C.I.A., Dr. James Reynolds of the University of Texas at Austin proposed establishment of a standing Research Committee composed of junior college instructional administrators and university professors who conduct or supervise research related to junior college instruction for the purpose of coordinating research needs with research expertise. The committee has met regularly since that date and this report contains abstracts of research into current problems identified by junior college personnel. Additional reports will be presented at the annual summer meeting of the association June 10-12, 1973.

The 1972-74 Research Committee

Dr. Kenneth H. Freeman, Professor and Director
The Junior College Center for Professional Development
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, TX 79409
806-742-7139

Dr. John R. Grable, Associate Professor and Coordinator
Community Junior College Graduate Program
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, TX 77340
713-295-6211-Ext 2947

Levi H. Hall
Dean of Faculty
Texarkana College
Texarkana, TX 75501
214-838-4541-Ext 265

Dr. Ray Hawkins, Junior College Coordinator
Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System
Austin, TX 78711
512-475-3413

Dr. Ralph Miller, Dean
Odessa College
Odessa, TX 79760
915-337-5381

Dr. James W. Reynolds, Professor of Curriculum and Instruction
Consultant in Junior College Education
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX 78712
512-471-3655

Dr. Robert S. Sloan
Dean of Arts and Sciences
Del Mar College
Corpus Christi, TX 78404
512-882-6231

Dr. Arthur Southerland
Dean of Instruction
Eastfield College
Mesquite, TX 75149

Dr. Richard Strahan, Professor of Education
The University of Houston
Houston, TX 77004
713-749-3559

George E. Thomas (Chairman)
Associate Dean for Academic Programs
College of the Mainland
Texas City, TX 77590
713-938-1211-Ext 222

Nathan F. Tubb
Academic Dean
South Plains College
Levelland, TX 79336
806-894-4921

Dr. James W. Tunnell, Associate Professor
Center for Community College Education
East Texas State University
Commerce, TX 75428
214-468-2988

Dr. Paul Webber
Associate Dean for Continuing Education
Alvin Junior College
Alvin, TX 77511
713-585-5311

THE REPORT

1. The Decision Making Process

*1.1 Selected Aspects of Internal Decision-Making in Public-Supported Community Colleges in Texas
Dr. Raymond Yell, Texas Tech University 1

1.2 A Study of the Management Systems of the Junior Colleges in the State of Texas
Dr. Dee Wheatley, III, University of Houston 14

*1.3 Internal Decision-Making as Perceived by Presidents of Texas Junior Colleges
Dr. James Reynolds, The University of Texas at Austin . . not included

2. Additional Topics

*2.1 A Study of Factors Which Influence Minority and Non-Minority Student Enrollment and Persistence in a Community College
Dr. Alvin Cannady, Texas Tech University 18

*2.2 A Study of Faculty Status in Texas Junior Community Colleges
Dr. Jim Tunnell, East Texas State University . . . . . not included

3. List of Other Research Completed or in Progress 31

4. Feedback Form 32

*Presented at the Annual Summer Meeting of T.A.J.C.I.A., Arlington, Texas, June 12, 1973

SELECTED ASPECTS OF INTERNAL DECISION-MAKING IN PUBLIC-SUPPORTED COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN TEXAS AS PERCEIVED BY ADMINISTRATORS, FACULTY MEMBERS, AND STUDENT LEADERS

A Doctoral Research Study

in

Higher Education

by

RAYMOND H. YELL

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. Kenneth H. Freeman, Chairman
Dr. Joe D. Cornett
Dr. Paul E. Thompson

College of Education
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, Texas

May 4, 1973

SELECTED ASPECTS OF INTERNAL DECISION-MAKING IN PUBLIC-SUPPORTED COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN TEXAS AS PERCEIVED BY ADMINISTRATORS, FACULTY MEMBERS, AND STUDENT LEADERS

Purpose: The purpose of this study was to determine if differences existed between the perceptions of administrators, faculty members, and student leaders concerning selected aspects of internal decision-making in public-supported community colleges in Texas.

Procedure: The researcher designed and constructed a questionnaire to elicit responses from administrators, faculty members, and student leaders in the public-supported community colleges in Texas. This questionnaire was mailed to sixty-five administrators, 220 faculty members, and 100 student leaders. Thirty-five administrators, 111 faculty members, and fourteen student leaders completed and returned the questionnaire.

Questions: Answers to the following specific questions were sought: (1) Are there significant differences in the relative importance placed upon selected areas of decision-making by administrators, faculty members, and student leaders? (2) How much relative importance do administrators, faculty members, and student leaders place upon these areas? (3) Will there be significant differences in the perceptions of administrators, faculty members, and student leaders concerning the extent to which the listed individuals and/or groups influence decision-making on selected areas? (4) Will there be differences in the perceptions between the administrators, faculty members, and student leaders concerning which individuals and/or groups may initiate action, have the final decision, and have an unknown influence on the listed areas? (5) Are there differences in the perceptions of administrators, faculty members, and student leaders concerning the

occurrence of discussions between the respondents and listed individuals and/or groups pertaining to the areas on which decisions must be made?
(6) Are there significant differences between the perceptions of administrators, faculty members, and student leaders concerning the usefulness of discussions between the respondents and the listed individuals and/or groups pertaining to the areas on which decisions must be made?

Analysis: The data obtained in response to questions one, three, and six were tested by chi-square tests to determine if there were significant differences between the perceptions of administrators and faculty members. The chi-square tests determined in which areas a significant difference in the perceptions of the two groups existed. The low number of responses from student leaders prevented the use of chi-square tests in comparing their perceptions with administrators and faculty members. Secondary analysis was substituted for comparing frequencies and percentages between the groups. Low expected frequencies for administrators and faculty members necessitated the use of secondary analysis in certain areas and for certain individuals and groups. The responses for the remaining questions were also analyzed by secondary analysis.

Findings of the Study: In answering question one the study found that there were significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty members concerning the importance in three of the listed areas of decision-making. Significant differences were found in their perceptions pertaining to the changing of instructional methods and materials, faculty representation in decision-making, and visitation of colleges. Administrators generally gave more importance to all areas than did faculty members and student leaders. This trend was upheld in changing instructional methods and materials where

faculty members and student leaders gave considerably less importance to this area than did administrators. In faculty representation in decision-making the faculty perceived less importance being given to this area than did the other groups. A noticeable exception to the general trend was found in visitation of colleges. Administrators perceived that this area was of little or no importance compared to the great or very great importance given by faculty members and student leaders. The areas perceived to be of greatest importance by all groups were the development of new courses and programs, selection of new personnel, attendance at conventions and conferences, and community service programs.

In answer to question two in ranking the areas for finding relative importance as perceived by the three groups some noticeable differences were found. Student leaders almost completely disagreed with the other groups. Administrators and faculty members agreed on the highest rankings, but disagreed on the lower ones. Student leaders gave the highest percentages of number one and two rankings to student representation in decision-making. They perceived that faculty representation in decision-making should be number three and the development of new courses and programs as number four. Student leaders split their highest percentages for the number five ranking between promotion of personnel, tenure of personnel, changing of instructional methods and materials, and community service programs. The administrators and faculty members agreed that selection of new personnel was the most important area and that development of new courses and programs was the second most important area. Faculty members thought that changing instructional methods and materials should be third, while administrators gave five different areas their highest percentages for the third most important area, one of which was changing instructional methods and materials. Selection of new personnel,

development of new courses and programs, student development programs, and community service programs were also ranked third by administrators. Faculty members considered faculty representation in decision-making as the most important area for both their fourth and fifth rankings. Administrators ranked student development programs and community service programs as their fourth ranking and community service programs as their fifth most important area.

In answering question three significant differences were found between the perceptions of administrators and faculty members concerning the extent to which listed individuals and groups influenced decision-making in the various areas.

In selection of new personnel the perceptions of administrators and faculty members differed significantly concerning the faculty's influence. Student leaders gave more influence to the administrative council, faculty senate, student president, and committees than did either administrators or faculty members. Administrators perceived more personal influence as indicated by "you personally" in this area than did other groups. All groups agreed that the president, vice president, dean, director, and department chairmen all have considerable influence in decision-making in this area. They all agreed that the academic council and student senate have little influence in the selection of new personnel.

The perceptions of administrators and faculty members concerning the promotion of personnel differed significantly only on the influence of the president. The faculty members perceived less influence for the president than did administrators. The administrators perceived more personal influence as indicated by "you personally" than did either faculty members of student leaders. The student leaders disagreed with the other groups on the influence

of ten individuals and groups. They perceived that these individuals and groups had more influence than did either the perceptions of administrators and faculty members. The president, vice president, dean, and department chairmen were considered by the three groups to have the greatest influence in the promotion of personnel.

Administrators gave more influence to the dean in tenure of personnel than did faculty members. This difference in their perceptions was found to be significant. Administrators and faculty members agreed on the influence of all listed individuals and groups except for their individual influence as indicated by "you personally". Administrators thought that they had more influence in this area than did either faculty members or student leaders. The student leaders disagreed with the other two groups on the influence of five individuals and groups. They gave more influence to four of the five individuals and groups than did either administrators or faculty members. On the fifth individual the student leaders gave less influence to the dean in this area than did administrators and faculty members. Perceptions of the groups indicated that the president, vice president, dean, and department chairmen have the greatest influence in tenure of personnel.

In work load of faculty the perceptions of administrators and faculty members were not found to differ significantly concerning the influence of the listed individuals and groups. Student leaders disagreed and again perceived more influence for the administrative council, faculty senate, and department chairmen. The groups perceived that the president, vice president, dean, director, and department chairmen had the greatest influence in the work load of the faculty.

No significant differences were found between the perceptions of administrators and faculty members concerning the influence of the various individuals and groups on the development of new courses and programs. The student leaders perceived more influence for six individuals and groups than did either administrators or faculty members. The development of new courses and programs were thought to be influenced by the president, vice president, dean, director, department chairmen, and faculty members.

No significant differences were found in the perceptions of administrators and faculty members concerning the influence of individuals and groups on changing instructional methods and materials. Student leaders disagreed with the other groups concerning the influence of five individuals and groups, and again they perceived more influence for four of the five than did administrators and faculty members. The perceptions indicated that the president, vice president, dean, department chairmen, and faculty members have the most influence in changing instructional methods and materials.

The influence of the academic council on faculty representation in decision-making was the only significant difference found in the perceptions of administrators and faculty members. The faculty members gave considerably less influence to the academic council in this area of decision-making than did either administrators or student leaders. The student leaders disagreed with the other groups by giving more influence to the director, administrative council, faculty, student senate, and less personal influence as indicated by "you personally" than did either administrators or faculty members. The president, vice president, dean, and department chairmen were perceived by the three groups to have the greatest influence pertaining to faculty representation in decision-making.

Concerning the visitation of colleges the only significant difference found in the perceptions of administrators and faculty members pertaining to the influence of individuals was for the individual influence of "you personally". The administrators perceived more influence than did either the faculty members or student leaders. The student leaders perceived more influence in this area for ten individuals and groups than did either the administrators or faculty members. Visitation of colleges was perceived to be influenced the most by the president, vice president, and dean.

Significant differences were found in the perceptions of administrators and faculty members concerning the influence of the president and the individual influence of "you personally" on attendance at conventions and conferences. In both instances the administrators perceived greater influence than did faculty members. The faculty members perceived that the influence of the student president, student senate, and committees on attendance at conventions and conferences was less than that perceived by administrators and student leaders. When student leaders disagreed, which was nine times, they again gave more influence than did administrators and faculty members to the individuals and groups. The president, vice president, director, and department chairmen were perceived to have the greatest influence on this area.

The influence of individuals and groups on student representation in college decision-making was the area in which the greatest number of significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty members occurred. Faculty members perceived less influence for the director of student activities, student president, student senate, committees, and their individual influence of "you personally" than did administrators. The student leaders perceived more influence for the faculty senate and faculty members than did the other two groups. All groups indicated that the president, vice

president, and dean had the greatest influence in student representation in decision-making. Administrators and student leaders also perceived great influence for the student president and student senate on student representation in college decision-making.

Concerning the student development program the only significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty members pertained to the influence of the director in this area of decision-making. The administrators and student leaders perceived great influence for the director while the faculty members perceived less influence for the director. The faculty members disagreed with the other groups concerning their individual influence of "you personally" on this area. They perceived less influence as individuals than the other groups. Student leaders disagreed with administrators and faculty members concerning the influence of the administrative council, faculty senate, academic council, department chairmen, and faculty members. Student leaders again perceived more influence for these individuals and groups than did either administrators or faculty members. All groups indicated that the president, vice president, dean, student president, and student senate had great influence on the student development program.

Community service programs was an area in which the perceptions concerning the influence of the director and "you personally" or the individual influence of administrators and faculty members were found to differ significantly. Administrators perceived more influence individually and for the director of the community service programs than did the other groups. The director was perceived by administrators to possess great influence in this area. Student leaders disagreed with the other groups by perceiving less influence for the president, vice president, dean, and more influence for the faculty senate, student president, student senate, and committees than did either administrators

or faculty members. Community service programs were perceived to be influenced by the president, vice president, dean, and director.

In question four concerning the final decisions the three groups indicated that the president possessed the authority to make final decisions in all areas; however, the administrators gave the highest percentages of the three groups. Faculty members' percentages were almost as high as administrators with student leaders having the lowest percentages in the area. The student leaders perceived more individuals and groups possessed the final decision-making authority than the other groups. This was noticeable in the work load of the faculty, development of new courses and programs, changing instructional methods and materials, faculty representation in decision-making, and student representation in decision-making. The faculty members perceived that the department chairmen have the authority to initiate action in the selection of new personnel, promotion of personnel, tenure of personnel, and the development of new courses and programs. The administrators perceived that more individuals and groups could initiate action in the various areas than did either faculty members or student leaders. Department chairmen were perceived to possess a great influence in initiating action in many areas by both administrators and faculty members. The director was perceived by administrators to possess initiating authority in several areas. Student leaders perceived many individuals and groups as being able to initiate action in the listed areas. The administrators perceived much greater initiating authority than the other two groups did individually as indicated by "you personally". There were unknown influences in every area listed, but the least unknown influence was in the area of the student development program.

In answering question five administrators indicated that they had success in having discussions pertaining to decision-making areas with all listed individuals and groups; however, faculty members perceived that they did not have discussions with the vice president, administrative council, faculty senate, academic council, student president, and student senate. Student leaders perceived no discussions with the administrative council, faculty senate, and academic council by a considerable majority.

In question six the perceptions of administrators and faculty members were found to differ significantly concerning the usefulness of discussions with the director, administrative council, faculty senate, student president, and student senate. The faculty members perceived that discussions with these five individuals and groups were less useful than did administrators. Student leaders perceived that discussions with the director were more useful and with the department chairmen were less useful than either administrators or faculty members. Administrators and faculty members perceived to have useful discussions with the department chairmen, while administrators and student leaders perceived to have useful discussions with the student president and student senate. The most useful discussions were perceived by all groups to take place with the president, dean, faculty members, students, and director.

Conclusions: Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions seem warranted.

1. Administrators generally perceived more importance for the areas of decision-making than did faculty members and student leaders.

2. The areas perceived to be of greatest importance by all groups were the development of new courses and programs, selection of new personnel, attendance at conventions and conferences, and community service programs.

3. Faculty members perceived that they had less influence in decision-making than administrators perceived for the faculty.

4. Faculty members did not perceive that they had significant influence in changing instructional methods and materials.

5. Differences in the perceptions of individual influence were significant in many areas.

6. Perceptions of communications were found to be different by the groups.

Recommendations: Perceptions of influence in decision-making are very important. As a result of the findings of this study the following recommendations are suggested for consideration:

1. Recommendation is made to take necessary action to achieve a common understanding between administrators and faculty members concerning the faculty's influence in decision-making.

2. Recommendation is made to take necessary action to achieve a common understanding between administrators and faculty members pertaining to the faculty representatives' influence in decision-making.

3. Recommendation is made that the faculty members be given more influence in changing instructional methods and materials.

4. Recommendation is made that the faculty be given more influence in the visitation of other colleges in order to keep faculty members acquainted with new instructional methods and materials.

5. Recommendation is made that a student leader be elected or appointed by the student senate to attend the meetings of the administrative council, faculty senate, and academic council in order to increase the occurrence of discussions between student leaders and these groups.

6. Recommendation is made that the faculty have an elected representative at each administrative council and student senate meeting.

7. Recommendation is made that the minutes of each mmeting of the administrative council, faculty senate, and student senate be available for all faculty members and student leaders.

8. Recommendation is made that the student president be available and attend the general faculty meetings in order to increase the occurrence of discussions between student leaders and faculty members.

Wheatley, Dee III. A Study of the Management Systems of the Junior Colleges in the State of Texas. Doctoral Dissertation. The University of Houston, December, 1971, 120 pages.

ABSTRACT

This investigation was concerned with the behavior of the professional personnel within the junior colleges in the state of Texas. The purpose of the study was two-fold: first, to ascertain the relationship of perception between the members of the Administrative Group (N-592) and the members of the Faculty Group (N-3,345), relative to the current and desired Likert management systems (SYSTEM 1: exploitive authoritative is management having no confidence or trust in subordinates; SYSTEM 2: benevolent authoritative is management having condescending confidence and trust in subordinates, such as master to servant; SYSTEM 3: consultative is management having substantial, but not complete, confidence and trust in subordinates; SYSTEM 4: participative group is management having complete confidence and trust in subordinates) of the junior colleges in the state; and second, to determine the statistical relationship of these perceptions to certain pre-determined institutional variables.

The review of related literature, from industry and business, from educational organizations, and from leading management theorists, supported the concept that participation in the decision-making process is considered advantageous by, and for, those who will be affected by the decisions. Research does not refute this concept.

A Likert 18 item questionnaire, in the form of a 20 segment continuum (FORM S), was mailed in the fall of 1970 to the members of the Administrative and Faculty Groups at fifty junior college campuses in Texas. Usable responses of 384 (65%) and 2,385 (71%), respectively, were received from these two groups. The forms were analyzed by correlational statistics, t-tests, and r to z transformations, which produced the findings below:

1. Members of the administrative sub-groups disagreed in their perceptions of the current management systems. Those members with higher ranking (president, second administrative officer, top non-academic officer, etc.) rated the current systems toward the participative system, while the lower officers ranked the systems to be more authoritative.

2. Members of the administrative sub-groups desired a participative group system.

3. There was disagreement among the Faculty Group's perceptions as to whether the colleges were benevolent authoritative or consultative.

4. Members of the Faculty Group desired a participative group management system.

5. The total Administrative Group rated their systems as being mostly consultative, whereas the total Faculty Group indicated that a benevolent authoritative system was in current practice.

6. The Administrative Group and the Faculty Group agreed that their systems should be participative group.

7. There was no statistically significant relationship between the perceptions of the Administrative Group, relative to the current management systems, and the institutional variables of college age; student enrollment; size of the administrative staff; size of the full-time faculty; but there was a statistically significant relationship to the operating budget.

8. There was no statistically significant relationship between the perceptions of the Administrative Group, relative to the desired management systems, and the institutional variables of college age; student enrollment; size of the administrative staff; size of the full-time faculty; and operating budget.

9. There was no statistically significant relationship between the perceptions of the Faculty Group, relative to the current management systems, and the institutional variables of college age; student enrollment; size of the full-time faculty; and operating budget.

10. There was no statistically significant relationship between the perceptions of the Faculty Group, relative to the desired management systems, and the institutional variables of college age; student enrollment; size of the administrative staff; size of the full-time faculty; and operating budget.

11. There was no statistically significant relation ship between the perceptions of the Administrative Group, relative to the current management, and the institutional variable of college affiliation.

12. There was no statistically significant relationship between the perceptions of the Administrative Group, relative to the desired management, and the institution al variable of college affiliation.

13. There was no statistically significant relationship between the perceptions of the Faculty Group, relative to the current management systems, and the institutional variable of college affiliation.

14. There was no statistically significant relationship between the perceptions of the Faculty Group, relative to the desired management systems, and the institutional variable of college affiliation.

15. There was no statistically significant relationship between the perceptions of the Administrative Group, relative to the current management systems, and the institutional variable of college geographical location.

16. There was no statistically significant relationship between the perceptions of the Administrative Group, relative to the desired management systems, and the institutional variable of college geographical location.

17. There was a statistically significant relationship between the perceptions of the Faculty Group, relative to the current management systems, and the institutional variable of college geographical location.

18. There was no statistically significant relationship between the perceptions of the Faculty Group, relative to the desired management systems, and the institutional variable of college geographical location.

A STUDY OF FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCE MINORITY AND NON-MINORITY STUDENT ENROLLMENT AND PERSISTENCE IN A COMMUNITY COLLEGE

By

ALVIN R. CANNADY

April 23, 1973

A STUDY OF FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCE MINORITY AND NON-MINORITY STUDENT ENROLLMENT AND PERSISTENCE IN A COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The problem of this study was to identify and analyze factors which influenced minority and non-minority student enrollment and persistence in a community college.

NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Universal higher education appears to be the result of increased societal pressures and a view that higher education provides essential credentials for upward mobility. Minority group students are increasingly insistent upon opportunities to attend college since society has represented higher education as one of the good things of life. The two year college has been selected as the instrument of this new social policy, universal higher education

The community college has been described as an "open-door" institution capable of providing equal educational opportunity in higher education. Any Texan who has attained the equivalence of a high school diploma or attained age eighteen is purportedly eligible for admission to the community college without regard to race, national origin or socioeconomic status.

However, recent data indicate under-representation of Black and Mexican-American students in institutions of higher education,

including Texas community colleges. A number of explanations of under-representation of minority students have been attempted. However, the consumer, high school graduates and college students, have rarely been consulted or involved in these explanation.

This study is an attempt to ascertain minority and non-minority student perceptions of factors which influenced their decisions about enrolling and/or persisting in a Texas community college.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

Need for the study may be summarized as follows:

1. There is a dearth of research specifically treating factors which influence minority student enrollment and persistence in Texas community colleges.
2. Factors influencing enrollment and persistence of minority and non-minority students should be identified so that Texas community colleges may better serve potential students.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

There were two purposes to be served by this investigation.

The first purpose was to identify and analyze factors which influenced enrolling and persisting at South Campus as perceived by minority and non-minority participants in the study.

The second purpose of the investigation was to identify and compare characteristics of non-attenders, non-persisters, and

graduates of South Campus.

DESIGN

The primary methodology of this research was the case study. Data were collected by means of a questionnaire designed to obtain pertinent information from three student samples. The three student samples provided perceptions of factors which influenced enrollment and persistence at South Campus from the viewpoint of non-attenders, non-persisters, and graduates of South Campus.

PROCEDURE

The researcher constructed a questionnaire to secure responses from samples of non-attenders, non-persisters, and graduates of South Campus, Tarrant County Junior College.

Part IV of the questionnaire elicited one of the following responses, "Positive-Encouraging," "Not an influence" or "Negative-Discouraging" to each of twenty-two factors of potential influence upon students decisions about enrolling and/or persisting at South Campus, (See Appendix A). Other sections of the questionnaire provided data to compare non-attenders, non-persisters, and graduates on sixteen selected characteristics. (See Appendix B).

From questionnaires mailed, 631 to non-persisters and 354 to graduates, usable responses were received from 146 non-persisters and 183 graduates. The researcher delivered questionnaires to 474 non-attenders and received 386 responses from this

sample providing a total of 715 usable questionnaires.

Statistical treatment of the data included analysis of frequencies and percentages for each sample of responses in each category for the twenty-two factors of influence as well as for the sixteen comparative characteristics. The chi-square technique was used to test for differences between samples and to test for differences between minority and non-minority respondents. The null hypothesis was to be rejected at the .05 level of confidence.

FINDINGS

Affirmation or Rejection of Hypotheses

H_o1. There will be no significant difference in the influence exerted by each of the twenty-two factors on decisions of minority and non-minority students to enroll or remain in college. This hypothesis was: supported for factors (13), (14) and (18); rejected at the .05 level of confidence for factor (19); rejected at the .02 level of confidence for factor (21); and rejected at the .01 level of confidence for the remaining seventeen factors.

H_o2. There will be no significant difference in the influence exerted by each of the twenty-two factors on decisions of minority non-attenders and minority non-persisters to enroll or remain in college. This hypothesis was supported for all factors except (7), (10), and (19). Factors (7) and (19) were rejected at the .01 level of confidence and factor (10) at the .02 level.

H_o3. There will be no significant difference in the influ-

ence exerted by each of the twenty-two factors on decisions of minority non-attenders and minority graduates to enroll or remain in college. This hypothesis was: supported for factors (5), (9), (11), (12), (19) and (20); rejected at the .05 level of confidence for factors (6), (10), (14), and (18); rejected for factor (8) at the .02 level; and rejected at the .01 level of confidence for the remaining eleven factors.

H_o4. There will be no significant difference in the influence exerted by each of the twenty-two factors on decisions of minority non-persisters and minority graduates. This hypothesis was supported for all factors except (2) and (5) where rejections occurred at the .05 level of confidence.

H_o5. There will be no significant difference in the socioeconomic status of minority non-attenders and Anglo-American non-attenders. This hypothesis was rejected at the .01 level of confidence.

H_o6. There will be no significant difference in the educational goals of minority and Anglo-American non attenders. This hypothesis was rejected at the .01 level of confidence.

H_o7. There will be no significant difference in the educational goals of minority and Anglo-American non-persisters. This hypothesis was rejected at the .01 level of confidence.

H_o8. There will be no significant difference in the educational goals of minority and Anglo-American graduates of South Campus. This hypothesis was supported.

General Conclusions

1. Using highest percentage response to one category of "Positive-Encouraging," "Not an Influence" or "Negative-Discouraging," non-attenders identified three factors as positive influences on their decisions about college attendance: (2) My interest in more schooling, (5) Interest and desire of my family and (6) Courses or programs offered. They identified one factor as a negative influence, (22) My knowledge of college costs, programs, and entrance requirements. Non-persisters identified the following seven positive influential factors: (2), (5), (6), (22), (4) Commuting distance to college, (7) Cost, and (13) Time for attending classes and working. Graduates identified eight factors exerting positive influences upon their decisions: (2), (4), (5), (6), (7), (22), (17) Attitude of college instructors and (21) Personal attention given students at college.

The factor which most influenced decisions of all three samples was (2), My interest in more schooling.

2. Non-attenders need better information about college costs, programs and entrance requirements. The negative influence identified by non-attenders for factor (22) warrants this conclusion.

3. Non-attenders (54 percent) and non-persisters (26 percent) were undecided or felt negative about "my interest in more schooling" while graduates (91 percent) indicated this a positive factor. Increased contact with college activities and/or representatives possibly results in increased interest in college attendance on the part of students or potential students.

4. Non-persisters and graduates of South Campus were more alike than different in identification of influences of the twenty-two factors upon their decisions about attending college. The basic difference between the two groups was degree of certainty or strength of endorsement rather than a difference in direction of influence. Graduates exhibited a greater certainty and concensus of opinion than did non-persisters.

5. Minority students and Anglo-American students were significantly different in their perceptions of influences exerted by the twenty-two factors.

This finding warrants the conclusion that, among those students involved in this study, ethnic background influences student perceptions of factors bearing upon opportunity to enroll and/or persist in a community college.

6. Non-attenders perceived their parents as having higher educational aspirations for them than they had for themselves. This was evident in that 46 percent indicated a positive influence for "my interest" while 48 percent indicated positive influence for "interest and desire of my family."

7. Non-attenders have lower educational and occupational aspirations than non-persisters or graduates. This is shown by the fact that non-attenders, in greater percentages, completed a general or vocational-technical oriented highschool program while the other groups completed general or college preparatory programs. In addition, non-attenders indicated a desire to develop occupational proficiency by serving as an apprentice or by attending a trade or vocational school. Non-persisters

aspired to attain a junior college degree or Bachelor's Degree while graduates indicated a desire for the Bachelor's Degree or Master's Degree.

8. Non-attenders are less certain about occupational plans than non-persisters or graduates.

Non-attenders were divergent in occupational choices as indicated by 10 to 20 percent selections from five of the six occupational choices. In comparison, non-persisters (89 percent) and graduates (93 percent) made three basic occupational choices.

"Professional work" was first occupational choice of non-attenders (40 percent), non-persisters (55 percent) and graduates (66 percent). Second choice of non-persisters and graduates was "owner or manager in business" while non-attenders chose "sales or clerical work".

9. Non-attenders came from homes characterized by "lower-middle" to "lower" socioeconomic levels while graduates and non-persisters were found in higher socioeconomic levels. Family income was also found to be lower for non-attenders than the other two groups. Minority non-attenders were significantly (.01 level) lower on the socioeconomic scale than Anglo-American non-attenders.

On socioeconomic factors "education of father or head of household", "annual income" and "number of rooms in home", non-attenders were consistently found on lower levels than non-persisters or graduates. Graduates fared little better than non-persisters on these measures. There were no significant differences between the three groups with regard to "number of books in the home".

For participants in this study, level of educational aspiration and attainment are proportional to socioeconomic status as computed by the American College Testing scale. A higher socioeconomic level predicts higher educational aspiration and attainment.

10. Although various research projects have found high-school grades as indicators of probable success in college, this study failed to support this conclusion. No significant differences were found in grades reported by non-attenders, non-persisters and graduates. This finding may have been influenced by the self-report of grades by respondents.

11. Parental influence upon non-attenders, non-persisters and graduates appears to be very strong. Each group identified "mother or father" as the person who most influenced their decision about attending and/or remaining in college. In addition, non-attenders (31 percent), non-persisters (44 percent) and graduates (45 percent) indicated that their parents "wanted them to go to college for sure". However, more non-attenders (40 percent) felt that their parents had "left it up to me".

Parents of Black students were most encouraging while Mexican-American students reported least parental encouragement to attend college.

12. Although non-attenders (83 percent), non-persisters (96 percent) and graduates (87 percent) intend to continue their education, non-attenders placed the beginning point two years or more in the future while non-persisters and graduates planned

to begin within one year.

Where these students planned to continue their education agreed with their selections of educational goals. Non-attenders were more interested in on-the-job training or vocational-trade schools. Non-persisters indicated the junior college as their preference for future education while graduates selected the four-year college or university as their choice.

APPENDIX A: INFLUENCE OF TWENTY-TWO FACTORS

1 Positive-Encouraging	2 Not an Influence	3 Negative-Discouraging	
			1. Financial aid from college
			2. My interest in more schooling
			3. Couldn't gain admission to a four year college
			4. Commuting distance to college
			5. Interest and desire of my family
			6. Courses or programs offered
			7. Cost
			8. Difficulty of college work
			9. My highschool preparation
			10. Availability of work
			11. My health
			12. Social activities at college
			13. Time for attending classes and working
			14. Transportation
			15. Attendance of friends at college
			16. Military service
			17. Attitude of college instructors
			18. Counseling services at college
			19. Marriage
			20. Racial composition of student body
			21. Personal attention given students at college
			22. My knowledge of college costs, programs, and entrance requirements

APPENDIX B: DATA FOR COMPARISON OF CHARACTERISTICS

The investigator compiled a list of characteristics which might provide distinguishing factors for non-attenders, non-persisters and graduates of a community college. These characteristics were selected from a survey of literature and recent research. Such sources as Carnegie Commission Reports, American College Testing Program, College Entrance Examination Board Reports, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Reports, and such researchers as Knoell (30), Willingham (49) and Ferrin (23), were consulted in an attempt to compile a comprehensive list of characteristics. The following items were selected as pertinent to this purpose of study: (1) age, (2) sex, (3) ethnic background, (4) marital status (5) type of high school program, (6) overall high school grade average, (7) one most influential person, (8) educational plans, (9) occupational plans, (10) educational attainment of father or head of household, (11) number of books in home, (12) estimated annual family income, (13) plans for future education, (14) attitude of parents, (15) number of rooms in home and (16) socioeconomic status.

OTHER RESEARCH COMPLETED OR IN PROGRESS

Political Science Faculty Requirements in Community Colleges of Texas
Dr. Paul G. McCoy
Department of Political Science
East Texas State University
completed February, 1973

Texas Junior College Freshman English Programs
Roger C. Schustereit (graduate student)
College of Education
The University of Texas at Austin
in progress

Leader Behavior of Department Heads and Student Leaders in Texas Junior Colleges
Francis P. Foy
Department of Education Administration
The University of Texas at Austin
in progress

JUNE 12, 1973

RESEARCH COMMITTEE SUGGESTION BOX

O.K., Committee, you asked for feedback from me, and I have a few minutes; here is what I think:

1. T.A.J.C.I.A. does not need a research committee. (True-False)

2. The committee should continue to _____

_____

_____

3. The committee should forget about _____

_____

_____

4. The committee should start _____

_____

_____

5. The most important research project next year should be _____

_____

_____

6. Other areas of concern which need research are _____

_____

_____

7. I here highly resolve to cooperate with the committee next year by supplying requested information. (True-False)

8. I had fun at the summer meeting of T.A.J.C.I.A. (True-False)

No essay necessary.

(over)

(Detach along this line.)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
AUG 29 1973
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

9. I read the 1971-72 Research Committee Report. (True-False)

10. I used information contained in the 1971-72 report. (True-False)

11. I read the 1972-73 Research Committee Report before attending the summer meeting. (True-False)

12. I would like to receive a semi-annual list of research in progress. (True-False)

13. The Research Committee Reports at the summer meetings could be improved by _____

_____

_____

14. I forgot to drop this in the Suggestion Box so I am mailing these suggestions to George Thomas, College of the Mainland, Texas City, TX 77590.

(also True-False)

_____
Signed